

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gm

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,474	08/02/2002	Ernst Kenk	KENK-1	9065
1444	7540 09/09/2004		EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW			MADSEN, ROBERT A	
SUITE 300			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20001-5303		1761	
			DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	—— <u>(</u>
Office Action Comments	10/088,474	KENK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Madsen	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addre	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thin period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this commu	unication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for al		ters, prosecution as to the me	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	narami nom consideration.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.			
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-15</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐		hy the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		onlication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been	received in this National Stag	e
application from the International Bu	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		-
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not i	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB	Paper No(s)  Notice of Int	)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>August 2, 2002</u> .	6) Other:		
S. Patent and Trademark Office			

Art Unit: 1761

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

- 1. Claims 6-15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Claim 5 is a multiple dependent claim, claim 6 depends from claim 5, and all subsequent claims depend from claim 6. Additionally, claims 15 is also in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. Claim 15 currently recites potatoes comprising the features of claims 2-14. Accordingly, the claims 6-15 not been further treated on the merits.
- 2. Claims 9,10,12-14 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 8. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. As recited, claim 9 depends from either claim 7 or claim 8. Claim 9 is an improper dependent claim with respect to claim 8 because claim 8 recites the preservative added *is* potassium sorbate. Thus, the preservative added is *either* sodium sulfite *or* potassium sorbate, not both. One could infringe on claim 9 without infringing on claim 8. For examination purposes only, claim 9 will be considered to be dependent from claim 7 only.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1761

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 4. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 5. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Wu, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of Ex parte Steigewald, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); Ex parte Hall, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and Ex parte Hasche, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 2-4, recite broad limitations (e.g. at least 4-20 days in claim 2) and the claims also recite "preferably" followed by a narrower statement of the broad limitation (e.g. preferably 15-20 days in claim 2).

Art Unit: 1761

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
 Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hullah (US 4579743).
- 8. Regarding claims 1-5, Hullah teaches any essentially water and gas tight packaging which can be easily sealed may be used as a package that is filled with 10-35% carbon dioxide and 65-90% nitrogen (Column 5, lines 49-67), as recited in claims 3 and 4, having French fried potatoes of 5% fat, 40-60% moisture (Column 5, lines 28-36, Column 6, lines 11-16), at any normal refrigeration storage temperature for 3-8 weeks as recited in claim 2 (column 6, lines 1-10), wherein the fries are treated with a preservative as recited in claim 5.

#### Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mason et al. (US 5486369) teaches preserving potato slices with potassium sorbate. Ruggermore (US 373527) teaches preserving cooked potatoes in carbon dioxide/nitrogen environments. Scavone et al. (US H2091H) teaches pre-fried potatoes coated with starch and preservatives. Bednar et al. (US 5242699) teaches pre-fried potatoes coated with starch.

Art Unit: 1761

Page 5

Shanbhag et al. (US 5000970) teaches pre-fried potatoes coated with starch that are refrigerated. Shatila (US 3959501) teaches pre-fried potatoes treated with preservatives and packaged in an inert gas package. Taylor et al. (US 5997938) and Kester et al. (US 6013296) teach oven-finished fries. Kemp et al. (US 5904946) teach single serving refrigerated French fries.

- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.
- 11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MILTON I. CANO

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700 Robert Madsen Examiner Art Unit 1761